

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the case. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that Claims 1-8 and 14 are allowed, and that Claims 15 and 16 are allowed pending resolution of the objection.

Claims 9-13, 15 and 16 have been objected to under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner stated essentially the specification does not teach to one of ordinary skill in the art "that when a third of the three buttons is depressed there is manipulation of the lever input device."

Claim 9 claims, *inter alia*, "to scroll within a displayed window by manipulation of the lever input device when a third of the three buttons is depressed." Claim 13 claims, *inter alia*, "to scroll within a displayed window by manipulation of the lever input device when the middle button is depressed."

Respectfully, the claims do not claim a manipulation of the lever due to the depression of a third or middle button, but rather that a scroll function is operated by manipulation of the lever input device when the third or middle button is depressed. Further, the use of a lever input device is described generally at, for example, col. 3, lines 26-43. The use of the lever input device instead of a mouse, in connection with embodiments of the invention, is described at col. 15, lines 12-15. Therefore, the manipulation of the lever input device when the third or middle button is depressed is believed to be described in such a way as to reasonably convey to one

skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time of the application was filed, has possession of the claimed invention.


Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 9-13 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Derocher et al. (USPN 5,914,702) in view of Siddiqui et al. (USPN 6,097,371). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Derocher and Siddiqui teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 9-13.

Claims 9 and 13 have been amended to include the limitations of allowable Claims 15 and 16, respectively. Therefore, Claims 9 and 13 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the present application, including Claims 1-14 are, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: April 19, 2007

Mailing Address:
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889